Hon. Richard A. Jones 1 2 3 4 5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 7 AT SEATTLE 8 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, No. 2:20-cr-00222-RAJ 9 Plaintiff, 10 v. ORDER DIRECTING REPLY FROM GOVERNMENT 11 JASON DESIMAS, 12 Defendant. 13 14 THIS MATTER, having come to the Court's attention on the Government's 15 Motion for Entry of a Discovery Protective Order, and the Court, having considered 16 the Motion, the defense's Response in Opposition to the Motion, and being fully 17 advised in this matter, hereby directs the government to file a reply to the defendant's response addressing the posted objections. 18 Specifically, the government's reply should include: 19 1. What explanation or justification can the government produce as to 20 why all information relating to *witnesses* should be treated as presumptively 21 protected material, and include an explanation why disclosure would work a clearly 22 defined and serious injury to every category of witnesses. 23 2. Explain how or why the disclosure of the substance of a witness's 24 statement would put a witness at risk. Include in this reply why redaction would not 25 be an alternative means to protect the information sought to be protected. 26

The Court encourages the parties to meet and confer in a good faith effort to resolve the issues raised in the motion and response, and present a mutually agreeable protective order. Otherwise, the Court **DIRECTS** the government to file its reply no later than February 12, 2021. DATED this 3rd day of February, 2021. United States District Judge